

To: Dave Kluesner/R2/USEPA/US@EPA[]
Cc: Alice Yeh/R2/USEPA/US@EPA[]; Elizabeth Butler/R2/USEPA/US@EPA[]; lizab
Butler/R2/USEPA/US@EPA[]
From: "Mark T. Ungar"
Sent: Mon 3/23/2009 4:02:02 PM
Subject: Re: CDF follow up

Dave (copy Alice and Elizabeth),

Thank you for the reply and update. I also appreciate Alice Yeh and Elizabeth Butler's contact information.

My interest in this matter is the same as yours..... Environmental Stewardship and doing what makes sense.

I am acting, not as an advocate, but as an independent agent that wants to make sure that all alternatives are considered. If I am able to make you aware of alternatives, then I have done my part.

Whether we are referring to the Fox River Remediation effort (Tetra Tech), or the Upper Hudson (G.E.), or Occidental Chemical (Arcadis) cleanup of the Passaic River, it is of utmost concern that we demonstrate best practices to manage everyone of these "clean-ups". These projects are setting a precedence and one cannot change history. Care must be taken to ensure that we not only bring this these issues to the surface publically, but spend the money wisely. This way, we are not just passing the responsibility along. In my opinion, these projects are being driven by engineered lobbyists and the United States is falling behind other part of the world as a result. Europe for example, is using innovated techniques and process improvements to clean up hazardous and contaminated waterways and eliminating the need for future remediation of the dredged material.

My experience on this subject was learned while working with Harbor Resource Management as a consultant on their demonstration project for the NY/NJ Harbor Dredged Material Feasibility Study that was conducted in 2005. I have also met with Eric Stern of the EPA to review this information.

Based upon the new knowledge and data that is now available on these matters, another review of best practices needs to be considered. The goal is clear, clean-up and not cover-up.

Phase One - Geotechnical mapping of area to isolate contamination.
Phase Two - Surgical containment and dredging.
Phase Three - Separation of contamination and storage, not CDF.
Phase Four - Ex-Situ Remediation and stabilization.
Phase Five - Beneficial uses of reclaimed soils.

I would be happy to disclose more details on this subject if you feel that this would be helpful including; process design, chemistries, alternative containment, storage and beneficial uses.

Thank you for your guidance.

Mark

----- Original Message -----

From: <Kluesner.Dave@epamail.epa.gov>

To: "Mark T. Ungar" <mtungar@verizon.net>

Cc: <Yeh.Alice@epamail.epa.gov>; <Butler.Elizabeth@epamail.epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, March 12, 2009 12:14 PM

Subject: Re: Lowerpassaic CDF

> Hi Mark. In reply to your email below:

> - the Passaic team is still working on the final options for the early
> action (lower 8-miles) cleanup proposals....we anticipate putting out a
> formal proposal for public review and comment this fall

> - no, the location and design have not been started or completed

>

> I am copying Elizabeth Butler (project manager for the removal project)

> and Alice Yeh (project manager for the early action) in the event that

> you have other technical questions or other information to share with

> the agency. Thank you for your interest in the Passaic cleanup.

>

>

> _____
> David Kluesner - Public Affairs

> U.S. EPA - Manhattan Office

> 290 Broadway, 26th Floor / NY, NY 10007

> 212.637.3653 / <http://www.epa.gov/region2>

>

>

>

>

> "Mark T. Ungar"

> <mtungar@verizon

> .net>

To

> Dave Kluesner/R2/USEPA/US@EPA

> 02/26/2009 09:25

cc

> PM

Subject

> Lowerpassaic CDF

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

> Dave,

>

> I was in attendance yesterday at the Adventus sponsored Best Practices

> conference in New Brunswick, NJ yesterday. This event reminded me of

> your email this past summer. In the email dated Monday, June 23rd, you

> announced the lower Passaic initiatives and partners. You also stated

> that the EPA is going to oversee all phases to ensure that best

> practices are considered.

>

> Two questions.

>
> 1.) What are the final options as a result of the FFS?
> 2.) In phase two you stated that lower concentrations of dioxin will be
> placed CDF. Has the design and location been finalized?
>
> I am asking as I have alternatives that may be advantageous in both
> aspects. I would be happy to detail my involvement with alternative
> decontamination treatments if you like. I am working closely with a
> partner who has already done a demonstration for the NY/NJ harbor
> project. I also wondered if composite materials have been considered as
> subsurface "storage" for this sediment. As liner material or cut-off in
> lieu of or conjunction with AquaBlok.
>
> Thanks for helping me with these questions. I hope that this is
> beneficial.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Mark Ungar
> (973) 896-0229
>
>

No virus found in this incoming message.
Checked by AVG - www.avg.com
Version: 8.0.237 / Virus Database: 270.11.10/1996 - Release Date: 03/11/09
20:42:00